



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,554	02/19/2002	Yumiko Seki	500.41210X00	1472
24956	7590	12/15/2005	EXAMINER	
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			VIG, NARESH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/076,554

Applicant(s)

SEKI ET AL.

Examiner

Naresh Vig

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20020219.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ZipForm (document labeled as Information on ZipForm) in view of Gajraj US Publication 2002/0002566.

Regarding claims 1 and 6, ZipForm teaches application preparation assisting method and system for assisting in preparing an application for making a document-based application [ZipForm page 11 – 13] to a public organization. ZipForm teaches:

ZipForm does not explicitly teaches acquiring information on a world-wide standard which defines contents that should be described in said application. However, ZipForm teaches Data Template [page 12]. However, Gajraj teaches A generic standard for DTDs is called Standard Generalised Markup Language (SGML) [Gajraj, 0004].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify ZipForm as taught by Gajraj to have a standard

format from which data is to be converted to a custom format. For example, it is known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Data Interchange Format (aka DIF) was one of the world standard format to transform data from first document (MS Excel) to second document (Lotus 123).

ZipForm in view of Gajraj teaches:

acquiring information on a standard unique to each country which is defined in detail in conformity to said world-wide standard (transforming a first document marked up according to a first document type definition, into a second document marked up according to a second document type definition) [Gajraj, 0014], and information on published applications and examinations unique to each country [ZipForm page 18, set for form for South Dakota Area and Kokomo Area]; and

assisting in preparing application documents based on said acquired information on the world-wide standard, information on the standard unique to each country acquiring information on a standard unique to each country which is defined in detail in conformity to said world-wide standard (transforming a first document marked up according to a first document type definition, into a second document marked up according to a second document type definition) [Gajraj, 0014], and information on the application and examination [ZipForm in view of Gajraj, 0014].

Regarding claims 2 and 7, ZipForm in view of Gajraj teaches capability for preparing and converting the application documents for a certain country to comply with

an application format or examination conditions in said country [Gajraj, 0014, ZipForm page 18, area specific forms].

Regarding claims 3 and 8, ZipForm in view of Gajraj teaches capability for acquiring information on documents which have been applied in a certain country (ZipForm, area specific form), and information on documents which have accepted permission from said country as a result of examinations after application [ZipForm, reuse data, data transferred to other forms]; and

assisting in preparing an application for another country with reference to said information on the documents [ZipForm, different area specific forms, page 18].

Regarding claim 4. ZipForm in view of Gajraj teaches electronically submitting the prepared application documents to perform electronic application processing.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ZipForm (document labeled as Information on ZipForm) in view of Gajraj US Publication 2002/0002566 and further in view of Abbruzzese et al. US Patent 5557515 hereinafter known as Abbruzzese.

Regarding claim 5, ZipForm in view of Gajraj teaches does not teach recording an entire manipulation procedure of an operator for preparing an application with the

assistance of application preparation as log information so that the log information can be viewed at a later time. However, Abbruzzese teaches an electronic activity log function maintains a record of key activities involved in the processing of work items [abstract].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify ZipForm in view of Gajraj as taught by Abbruzzese to automatically and securely maintain a record of the activities of all staff members in work processing.

Conclusion

Applicant is required under 37 CFR '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naresh Vig whose telephone number is (571) 272-6810. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 6:00 (Wednesday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Naresh Vig
Examiner
Art Unit 3629

December 11, 2005